

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the Official Action mailed September 05, 2006 and the indication of allowable subject matter.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefinite claim language. The Examiner suggested that dependent claim 7 should properly depend from claim 1 instead of claim 2. By way of the foregoing amendment, the allowable subject matter of claim 2 has been added to independent claim 1 thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triberti (EP 0 825 510). Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triberti '510 in view of the admitted prior art cited at page 2 of the instant specification.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the above amendment which adds the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 2 into independent claim 1.


No new matter is contained in the foregoing amendments.

Applicant has also added a new claim 8 which includes the subject matter set forth in Figure 1 and original paragraph 17 (page 3, lines 23-26), whereby the water box includes, in a single piece, the protrusions 10, 10', the peripheral wall 1' and the portion of the frontal spindle. The structural arrangement of new claim 8 has the same advantage as allowable claim 1 as amended, i.e., to provide a pre-fabricated module that avoids the use of sealing strips.

Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing amendment places the instant application in condition for allowance. Should the Examiners believe that further discussion would advance prosecution, they are invited to contact the undersigned.

Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0548.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Matthew Stavish  
Registration No. 36,286

Berenato, White & Stavish  
6550 Rock Spring Drive  
Suite 240  
Bethesda, Maryland 20817  
(301) 896-0600